

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-12 and 14-20 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 12 and 19 are in independent form. Claims 1, 12 and 19, the independent claims, have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 19 and 20. The changes made to Claim 19 are purely formal ones not believed to affect allowability.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-12, 14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,804,832 (Crowell) in view of U.S. Patent 5,796,109 (Frederick). Claims 3 and 15 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from *Crowell* in view of *Frederick* and U.S. Patent 6,211,626 (Lys et al.).

The background and general nature of the aspects of the invention set forth in claims 1 and 12 have been discussed in previous papers, as has the prior art, and it is not believed to be necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Accordingly, Applicant will comment only on those points believed to require it.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in independent Claim 1 has an elastic support means, such as for example that shown at 8a in Fig. 1, that pressurizes the radiation image detection panel 1 toward the outer enclosure 3, and cushioning material 7 is provided between the pressurized surface of the outer enclosure and the radiation image detection panel.¹ Since the radiation image detection panel is pressurized by the elastic support means toward the outer enclosure, the cushioning material is disposed there.

¹/ The claim scope, of course, is not to be limited by the details of the preferred embodiment(s) referred to for illustrative purposes.

In the *Crowell* structure, nothing that would correspond to the recited cushioning material is provided. This is because the *Crowell* device does not have a construction in which the radiation image detection panel is pressurized by the cushioning material toward the outer enclosure. Moreover, Applicant submits that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Frederick* that would disclose or suggest the above structure. As the Examiner has correctly pointed out, a cushioning material is shown in Fig. 28. That cushioning material, however, serves by itself to reduce shock or damage inside a casing, and does not cooperate in any fashion with an elastic support means for that purpose. Further, in *Frederick*, no cushioning material is provided between the radiation detection panel on a radiation incident side and the outer enclosure. The cushioning material is instead provided on the side. Assuming for argument's sake that one of ordinary skill might consider adding a cushioning material to the *Crowell* structure, Applicant can see no reason for which a person of merely ordinary skill would be motivated to position such cushioning material in the specific fashion recited in Claim 1, i.e., between the radiation detection panel on a radiation incident side and the outer enclosure. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over these two patents, taken separately or in any proper combination.

Independent Claim 12 also recites the feature of cushioning material provided between a radiation detection panel on a radiation incident side and an outer enclosure, and is therefore also allowable over *Crowell* and *Frederick*.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as

references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, she is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 393511 v1